

RECEIVED

SEP 13 2022

THOMAS G. BRUTON
CLERK, U.S. DISTRICT COURT

RIGHT TO SUE IN FEDERAL COURT
Case # 440-2022-02501
(via Alison Fisher)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS
EASTERN DIVISION

ROSE MEACHAM, Plaintiff,

v.

University of Illinois, Defendant.

et. al.

) No
) JURY TRI
)

1:22-cv-04961

Judge Virginia M. Kendall
Magistrate Sheila M. Finnegan
RANDOM

(please see attached for full list)

COMPLAINT: RETALIATION

I was issued a Right to Sue letter from the EEOC regarding incidents that I have reported about University of Illinois and now the State of Illinois. I have been denied my rights to report Threats to Human Life, Scientific Fraud, Data Fabrication, Medical Malpractice, and other crimes. My attempts to report these incidents have been impeded and blocked by the Defendants, and I have been retaliated against horribly by the Defendants and related parties.

I was a PhD Student Employee in the Neuroscience Program, and Biology Department. My research focus was Computational Neuroscience and I have years of experience working in laboratories around the world -- from CERN, to Rockefeller University, collaborations with Princeton University, New York University, Stanford, Google, Apple Adobe, and others. While I was retaliated against by UI for my reports, I hope that your Honours will view the retaliation itself and the motives for the criminal retaliation against me.

My involvement with UI, Defendants, began around 2014 and I was a sought after candidate by UI for years to come. When I began my employment at UI officially in Fall 2017, I had already completed Graduate-Level courses at NYU and abroad. I technically have earned more than enough credits to receive a Doctorate Degree today, and I have approximately 3-5 unpublished papers, and multiple Posters accepted to conferences around the world. However, due to the retaliation from Defendants, I have been denied my PhD Diploma in the State of Illinois, because I followed the laws to report criminal activities such as Medical Malpractice, Scientific Fraud, Data Fabrication and cover-ups. I was instructed to report these incidents by UI Officials, and by other Authorities, however the Defendants and perpetrators of the crimes have abused the University of Illinois Academic and Administrative Systems to Retaliate against me in a way

that has devastated me physically, financially, professionally, personally -- and even my friends and family have been negatively impacted by their continued acts of harms.

I have done nothing but follow the instructions of UI employees, however there seems to be a situation of in-fighting with political motives, personal motives, and other unprofessional activities that requires the oversight of the Illinois State Courts. The systemic cover-up for crimes perpetrated by Defendants is a perfectly polished machine -- Legal Teams are assigned to take informant intake reports at such an early stage that a falsified papertrail is created from the beginning. Unbelievable tactics were used repeatedly like forcing me to hold off-the-record informal in-person meetings without witnesses and when authorities tried to intervene the Defendants tried to claim these meetings were a requirement of my job, part of my responsibilities at UI, when they were not. Instead, these meetings were used to threaten me and engage in biased, often politically motivated rhetoric that constitutes a fireable workplace offense. Many of these conversations included statements about premeditated acts of violence, physical harms, abuses of power, and Scientific Medical Research that violates the Rights of American Citizens in exchange for profit and career awards. I was punished repeatedly by Defendants for cooperating with authorities to report these unlawful activities and forms of harm to the General Public. The punishments were carried-out in such a manner that the fear of the other Informants who chose to remain silent about the crimes I reported made more sense to me by the end of my reports; after I was forced to endure the retaliation outlines in this case.

My case will show that the retaliation also included contract changes whereby the Defendants I was told to report were removed from permanent records as having any involvement with me. If people were to investigate these incidents I am reporting at a later date, the times and dates of reports to authorities have been changed in such a manner that the entire case is undermined without my evidence and without my testimony. Please note that the Defendants are professional evidence collectors, trained as Scientists to collect and analyze evidence and data as part of our jobs. Unfortunately, this seems to be a case whereby the Defendants are abusing this training to falsify evidence and fabricate erroneous data to cover-up their own criminality.

My case will show that there is a system in place State-wide, and possibly in other parts of the USA, whereby people are able to evade punishment for prejudices, harms, and criminal activities through retaliation and other means.

People are exhibiting a tendency to put themselves first, before others, even when the other people are disabled, physically injured, raped, and harmed. People do not address the harms, criminal activities, rape injuries, physical damages when these incidents are brought in front of them -- instead people are fearing legal retribution, fearing being found out, fearing punishments, fearing looking bad in front of their peers, and these people are harming the victims in front of them even more in order to evade consequences.

People evading consequences have the upper hand, and these people exploit legal systems, administrative systems, and other positions in order to use their knowledge of the laws and systems as an advantage over the victims -- to manipulate the situation, commit fraud, fabrication of evidence, evidence blocking, evidence tampering, destruction of evidence, and to harm informants to the point they remain silent about Threats to Human Lives.

My case is about RETALIATION. This case will show that the Defendants and others in the State of Illinois, and possibly elsewhere, worked together in an intricate system of harm designed to give "snitches stitches" -- to physically abuse, financially harm, and destroy the lives of people who report the Defendants for their crimes. The retaliation is designed to undermine the complaints or reports filed by Informants about Defendants at all costs.

My case in particular shows that the Defendants medically injured me intentionally through an intentionally dysfunctional medical, scientific system throughout the State of Illinois (possibly other parts of the USA).

This is a vital case to the United States of America at this point in history, due to the facts that the types of harms and damages that were done to me could easily be done to another person. These damages and harms could easily be done to another person who is perfectly healthy, showing no signs of any health complications, but the end result would be symptoms that trigger a system of continued harm that destroys lives, devastates families, and leaves the Informants destitute and physically unable to perform at their normal abilities for the rest of their lives.

The power that has been invested in the Doctors, Scientists, who I am reporting to your Honours in the State of Illinois, is extremely important -- it is, in fact, the power to give life and the power to take life. These Doctors, Scientists, are trained in good faith to perform a duty for the American People -- and we all trust that the power we give to these Medical Doctors, Scientists, will not be exploited for personal gain, for personal vengeance, for personal wants of any kind. However, the evidence in my case proves that the trust of the American People in these Doctors, Scientists, is being violated to the extent that the lives of the American People are being placed at risk in order for these Defendants to gain personally and in horrible ways -- including exploiting students for unwanted sexual advances and rape.

The funding for these crimes comes from the American People -- the American tax-payer -- and the Defendants have stated in writing that the "drain" on resources it took to hire lawyers / administration to cover-up the crimes I'm reporting in this Federal Case is an exhaustive amount of money and resources.

I bring this case before your Honours today, because it is my goal to make certain the American Citizens, and Illinois State Citizens, understand what is being done here on their dime. And to warn the American Citizens about this system of medical abuse, scientific harms, fraud, and malpractice that could (or may have already) impacted their lives in horrific ways.

I am hoping that my case will result in law changes throughout the State of Illinois, and the country as needed, in order to ensure the safety and protection of the American People. I am NOT asking for money and I am NOT asking for any financial gain whatsoever — nor will I accept any if it is offered. I am hoping that one of the results from this case will be a safer, faster way for PhD Students, witnesses and employees to report Medical Malpractice / Scientific Fraud, Data Fabrication and HIPPA violations, IRB violations, or other violations of the protective systems in place to ensure our safety. I am also hoping that the American People will be able to see that there are not enough protective laws in place to ensure that the temptations to exploit the power given to Doctors, Scientists, are not acted upon.

The few laws we have in place are not enough. And I am hoping to propose that the Federal Government outlaw the Patenting and/or Trademarking of Human DNA and other personal Biological Material associated with Human Beings due to the facts that Doctors, Scientists, are using these patents and/or trademarks to grow them in Laboratories.

In short, some of the topics I hope to bring before your Honours include:

- No Tolerance Laws that require immediate termination of employees with certain levels of higher-training (Engineers, Computer Scientists, Medical Researchers, Doctors, etc) who abuse this training and expert knowledge to harm other people or engage in unlawful activities of any kind (i.e. my case involves Engineers who hack civilians, and Scientists, Medical Doctors who harm people)

- Laws to protect Informants in unique positions of power such as higher-education, Medical, Scientific positions of employment

- Safer, faster reporting processes for witnesses (often Students / Employees) of Medical, Scientific Malpractice, Fraud and/or Data Fabrication

- Laws to protect the Rights of Human Beings being grown and/or experimented on in Medical, Scientific Laboratories

- Laws to ban the property ownership of Human Biological, Genetic material

- Stricter laws on the role of Doctors, Scientists in Society — namely preventing Doctors from overstepping their roles to make judicial determinations about which American Citizens will have the Civil, State, Federal Rights of Human Beings and which American Citizens will have those Constitutional Rights taken away

- Stricter punishments for Doctors who break Labor Law Violations in a Professional and/or Academic Setting

- Clearer laws regarding the Student Employee with a focus to eliminate the system of retaliation being used by Employers (such as Defendants) who punish Employees Academically when the Employees report criminal activities, such as Medical Malpractice, Scientific Fraud, Data Fabrication, Threats to Human Life, and more

- Stricter punishments for Tenured Doctors who violate the law

- Stricter review processes to test validity for Scientific Research and Medical Research

- Reporting processes for the "General Public" when treatments, medications, and other scientific products have negative impacts on their lives -- reporting processes that are linked to the specific scientific research that was used to develop these products so Doctors, Scientists can reference this feedback from the "General Public" (also referred to as "Laymen" among Doctors, Scientific Researchers)

- Stricter requirements for detailing the "data cleaning" techniques and other behind-the-scenes methods used to produce Scientific Results from studies and experiments

Again, I am not asking for financial compensation of any kind for this case and I am not trying to be demanding with the suggested topics above. I am simply trying to bring to your Honours attention these vital issues in the Field of Medicine and Scientific Research, with the hopes of improving the Labor Laws related to these fields of Employment, and Academic Employment. Academic Employment is in need of clarification for the Institutions such as University of Illinois because it is currently being misused by people in power to abuse employees, cover-up crimes, and get away with other labor law violations that become complicated when the same assignments are given for both Academic Credit and Paid Employment Positions. The Medical Abuses I am also reporting, some of which occurred arguably as a form of retaliation and silencing, include unlawful employment violations to Medical Care access, and biased medical treatments, etc that are used for profit by UI and their affiliates (listed as formal Defendants in my case).

Corrupted hiring and firing policies, as well as contractual violations are actually crucial to the improvement of the systemic harms that I am reporting to your Honours in this case. My case will prove that University of Illinois, and perhaps other Institutions throughout the country, are in fact firing Doctors / Doctors-in-Training who speak out about Medical Malpractice, Violence towards women and other people. The Labor Law Violations that I witnessed and reported at University of Illinois are being used to recruit and maintain a staff of people who are intentionally accepting bribes, promotions, and succumbing to threats to remain silent about Scientific Fraud, Medical Malpractice, Data Fabrication and more. My particular case is extremely important because I was an impartial, unbiased person but I was attacked by people with political extremist views who made statements that they support the murder of people who do not join them in their pursuits. I was fired and, despite my impartiality, I was repeatedly threatened and retaliated against in ways that warrant the immediate dismissal of certain parties -- or at

minimum warrant new policies to be implemented so that Doctors, Scientists, can object to murdering people and not be fired from University of Illinois.

By creating a hostile work environment with countless Labor Law Violations used to silence or fire people who report Threats to Human Life, the Doctors, Scientists on this labor force become a weapon against the American People – and are made up of individuals who will do and say anything in order to receive a paycheck, rewards, promotions, funding, degrees of vanity, and more.

I do not mean to sound extreme, however I followed every single University of Illinois internal process for reporting and handling the Medical Malpractice / Scientific Fraud, Data Fabrication related crimes that I witnessed (and I was instructed to report by Chancellors and other officials) but UI repeatedly retaliated against me in such an expert fashion through the Administration and Academically that it is obvious this is a repeat pattern of practice that will not stop unless the Illinois Courts intervene. I am not trying to single out University of Illinois by any means, and I also know that there have been silenced reports of Medical Malpractice / Scientific Fraud, Data Fabrication at other Institutions in the USA, however this case is on the extreme side. And it is therefore my goal to make certain that proper policies and reporting procedures can be put in place to ensure the safety of the American People.

Other Doctors, Scientists, have reported to me that their motivations for remaining silent about Medical Malpractice, Scientific Fraud, Data Fabrication, and related crimes, is due to the fact that the PhD is such an investment of time and money that they cannot afford to report these crimes. These informants have explained to me that one of the consequences currently in place for reporting these crimes is the retraction of the PhD Students (Doctors-in-Training) thesis work – this means that the current system punishes the informants by getting rid of the work they did in order to earn their PhD Degrees. I understand this is a tricky situation for everyone involved – people should not be rewarded for being informants or get special treatment for being informants.... however, it is our job as Medical Doctors, Scientists, to improve the lives of people throughout the country and not pose a danger to their lives. I am hoping that your Honours and the State of Illinois can help in finding a solution through the laws and judicial system where witnesses to these Threats to Human Life can report to proper authorities and not be forced to repeat their entire PhDs, as the Doctorate Candidates have complained to me is one of the reasons they remain silent about harms to the American People.

In other words, I bring before your Honours a case that raises issues that are affecting the lives of people across the country. I believe this case is crucial – these issues are crucial – to have a fair, judicial, unbiased ruling on in order to ensure the safety of the American Public as we enter a new era of Scientific Innovation.

As people engage in more invasive technologies used on their bodies including medications that impact their behavior, not just their health, and other technologies such as Invitro Fertilization, STEM Cell Research, or Biochemical Alterations to people's gender -- now more than ever it is crucial that we, as a country, put the proper laws in place to protect the lives of American Citizens. And it is crucial that we put laws in place to ensure that the Global Scientific Community is not polluted by misinformation, falsified scientific evidence, bogus results, or lies in print that could alter the research being done in other countries around the world. One bad paper, or a falsified body of research, could impact the work of Scientists, Doctors, for centuries to come. For example, Darwin's work was published hundreds of years ago, and yet it still remains the foundational work taught to all scientists in basic Biology courses throughout the USA today.

One small lie, data fabrication, or cover-up for fraud today could in fact mean generations of harmful Scientific Research and harmful Medical Treatments -- the Scientific Research published remains in the Scientific Archives and is used by the communities around the world forever. And there is no predicting how people will use the work we are doing today. I therefore implore your Honours to accept my case, and to please review this evidence and the issues seriously so that we can ensure the safety of the United States Citizens, and ensure the sanctity of the Research Community as a whole.

Thank you so much for reading my statements for this case and I hope that a fair, judicial review of these incidents can take place in order to correct these harms, and prevent them from occurring again in the future.

Sincerely,

Rose Meacham



U.S. EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Chicago District Office
230 S Dearborn Street
Chicago, IL 60604
(800) 669-4000
Website: www.eeoc.gov

DETERMINATION AND NOTICE OF RIGHTS

(This Notice replaces EEOC FORMS 161 & 161-A)

To: Miss Rose Meacham
5540 S Hyde Park Blvd Apt 527
CHICAGO, IL 60637

Charge No: 440-2022-02501

EEOC Representative and email: Alison Fisher
Investigator
Alison.fisher@eeoc.gov

DETERMINATION OF CHARGE

The EEOC issues the following determination: The EEOC will not proceed further with its investigation and makes no determination about whether further investigation would establish violations of the statute. This does not mean the claims have no merit. This determination does not certify that the respondent is in compliance with the statutes. The EEOC makes no finding as to the merits of any other issues that might be construed as having been raised by this charge.

NOTICE OF YOUR RIGHT TO SUE

This is official notice from the EEOC of the dismissal of your charge and of your right to sue. If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) on this charge under federal law in federal or state court, **your lawsuit must be filed WITHIN 90 DAYS of your receipt of this notice.** Receipt generally occurs on the date that you (or your representative) view this document. You should keep a record of the date you received this notice. Your right to sue based on this charge will be lost if you do not file a lawsuit in court within 90 days. (The time limit for filing a lawsuit based on a claim under state law may be different.)

If you file a lawsuit based on this charge, please sign-in to the EEOC Public Portal and upload the court complaint to charge 440-2022-02501.

On behalf of the Commission,

Digitally Signed By: Julianne Bowman
6/15/2022

Julianne Bowman
District Director

Cc: University of Illinois

Please retain this notice for your records.

Enclosure with EEOC Notice of Closure and Rights (01/22)

INFORMATION RELATED TO FILING SUIT UNDER THE LAWS ENFORCED BY THE EEOC

*(This information relates to filing suit in Federal or State court **under Federal law**. If you also plan to sue claiming violations of State law, please be aware that time limits may be shorter and other provisions of State law may be different than those described below.)*

IMPORTANT TIME LIMITS – 90 DAYS TO FILE A LAWSUIT

If you choose to file a lawsuit against the respondent(s) named in the charge of discrimination, you must file a complaint in court **within 90 days of the date you receive this Notice**. Receipt generally means the date when you (or your representative) opened this email or mail. You should **keep a record of the date you received this notice**. Once this 90-day period has passed, your right to sue based on the charge referred to in this Notice will be lost. If you intend to consult an attorney, you should do so promptly. Give your attorney a copy of this Notice, and the record of your receiving it (email or envelope).

If your lawsuit includes a claim under the Equal Pay Act (EPA), you must file your complaint in court within 2 years (3 years for willful violations) of the date you did not receive equal pay. This time limit for filing an EPA lawsuit is separate from the 90-day filing period under Title VII, the ADA, GINA or the ADEA referred to above. Therefore, if you also plan to sue under Title VII, the ADA, GINA or the ADEA, in addition to suing on the EPA claim, your lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of this Notice **and** within the 2- or 3-year EPA period.

Your lawsuit may be filed in U.S. District Court or a State court of competent jurisdiction. Whether you file in Federal or State court is a matter for you to decide after talking to your attorney. You must file a "complaint" that contains a short statement of the facts of your case which shows that you are entitled to relief. Filing this Notice is not enough. For more information about filing a lawsuit, go to <https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

ATTORNEY REPRESENTATION

For information about locating an attorney to represent you, go to:
<https://www.eeoc.gov/employees/lawsuit.cfm>.

In very limited circumstances, a U.S. District Court may appoint an attorney to represent individuals who demonstrate that they are financially unable to afford an attorney.

HOW TO REQUEST YOUR CHARGE FILE AND 90-DAY TIME LIMIT FOR REQUESTS

There are two ways to request a charge file: 1) a FOIA Request or 2) a Section 83 request. You may request your charge file under either or both procedures. EEOC can generally respond to Section 83 requests more promptly than FOIA requests.

Since a lawsuit must be filed within 90 days of this notice, please submit your request for the charge file promptly to allow sufficient time for EEOC to respond and for your review. Submit a signed written request stating it is a "FOIA Request" or a "Section 83 Request" for Charge Number 440-2022-02501 to the District Director at Julianne Bowman, 230 S Dearborn Street

Chicago, IL 60604.

You can also make a FOIA request online at <https://eeoc.arkcase.com/foia/portal/login>.

Enclosure with EEOC Notice of Closure and Rights (01/22)

You may request the charge file up to 90 days after receiving this Notice of Right to Sue. After the 90 days have passed, you may request the charge file only if you have filed a lawsuit in court and provide a copy of the court complaint to EEOC.

For more information on submitting FOIA Requests and Section 83 Requests, go to:
<https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/foia/index.cfm>.

NOTICE OF RIGHTS UNDER THE ADA AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008 (ADAAA)

The ADA was amended, effective January 1, 2009, to broaden the definitions of disability to make it easier for individuals to be covered under the ADA/ADAAA. A disability is still defined as (1) a physical or mental impairment that substantially limits one or more major life activities (actual disability); (2) a record of a substantially limiting impairment; or (3) being regarded as having a disability. *However, these terms are redefined, and it is easier to be covered under the new law.*

If you plan to retain an attorney to assist you with your ADA claim, we recommend that you share this information with your attorney and suggest that he or she consult the amended regulations and appendix, and other ADA related publications, available at:
http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/disability_regulations.cfm.

“Actual” disability or a “record of” a disability

If you are pursuing a failure to accommodate claim you must meet the standards for either “actual” or “record of” a disability:

- ✓ **The limitations from the impairment no longer must be severe or significant** for the impairment to be considered substantially limiting.
- ✓ In addition to activities such as performing manual tasks, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, learning, thinking, concentrating, reading, bending, and communicating (more examples at 29 C.F.R. § 1630.2(i)), **“major life activities” now include the operation of major bodily functions**, such as: functions of the immune system, special sense organs and skin; normal cell growth; and digestive, genitourinary, bowel, bladder, neurological, brain, respiratory, circulatory, cardiovascular, endocrine, hemic, lymphatic, musculoskeletal, and reproductive functions; or the operation of an individual organ within a body system.
- ✓ **Only one** major life activity need be substantially limited.
- ✓ Except for ordinary eyeglasses or contact lenses, the beneficial effects of **“mitigating measures”** (e.g., hearing aid, prosthesis, medication, therapy, behavioral modifications) **are not considered** in determining if the impairment substantially limits a major life activity.
- ✓ An impairment that is **“episodic”** (e.g., epilepsy, depression, multiple sclerosis) or **“in remission”** (e.g., cancer) is a disability if it **would be substantially limiting when active**.
- ✓ An impairment **may be substantially limiting even though** it lasts or is expected to last **fewer than six months**.

Enclosure with EEOC Notice of Closure and Rights (01/22)

“Regarded as” coverage

An individual can meet the definition of disability if an **employment action was taken because of an actual or perceived impairment** (e.g., refusal to hire, demotion, placement on involuntary leave, termination, exclusion for failure to meet a qualification standard, harassment, or denial of any other term, condition, or privilege of employment).

- ✓ “Regarded as” coverage under the ADAAA no longer requires that an impairment be substantially limiting, or that the employer perceives the impairment to be substantially limiting.
- ✓ The employer has a defense against a “regarded as” claim only when the impairment at issue is objectively **both** transitory (lasting or expected to last six months or less) **and** minor.
- ✓ A person is not able to bring a failure to accommodate claim **if** the individual is covered only under the “regarded as” definition of “disability”.

***Note:** Although the amended ADA states that the definition of disability “shall be construed broadly” and “should not demand extensive analysis,” some courts require specificity in the complaint explaining how an impairment substantially limits a major life activity or what facts indicate the challenged employment action was because of the impairment. Beyond the initial pleading stage, some courts will require specific evidence to establish disability. For more information, consult the amended regulations and appendix, as well as explanatory publications, available at http://www.eeoc.gov/laws/types/disability_regulations.cfm.*

[If you need additional space for ANY section, please attach an additional sheet and reference that section.]

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
Rose Meacham)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendants:)	

COMPLAINT

University of Illinois
State of Illinois
Illinois State Bar Association

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

Brad Sutton

Alexander Cerjanic

Neal Cohen

Aaron Barbey

Michael Key

Samuel Bershers

Martha Gillette

Sepideh ~~Bar~~ Sadaghiani Friberg

Rhanor Gillette

Justin Rhodes

Gene Robinson

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

Board of Education

(OCR) Office Conflict Resolution

Danielle ~~Morrison~~ Morrison
Margaret A. Lawler

*Husch Blackwell LLP

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

Alexis Thompson
Allison McKinney

Justin Brown
Debra Imel

* Zofu Cheng
Katherine C. Snyder
Stephen Bryan
Danita Brown Young

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

Office of Student Conflict Resolution (OSCR)
Deans Offices

(BIT) Behavioral Intervention Team

Champaign Police

(UIPD) University of Illinois Police Department

Human Resources, University of Illinois

(OAE) Office of Access and Equity

[If you need additional space for ANY section, please attach an additional sheet and reference that section.]

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

Surangi Punyasena
Stephen Downie

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

McKinnley Health Centers

Carle Hospitals
* Janise Marie Phillips Regina Harrington

* Student Assistance Center Deans

Neuroscience Program (NSP) (Not a Department --
no other Neuroscience
"Program" in USA as far
as I know)

Biology Department

Engineering Department

Robert Crossgrove, NSF

William Scott Carr, NSF

Zita R. Barnett, NSF

Rhonda J. Davis, NSF

* Board of Directors

Board of Trustees

National Science Foundation

National Institute of Health

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

UIC Chancellors
Linda Deanna
Steve Linn
Ajla Smajlovic
Maryam Zaroudi
Sophia Irini Hamilton
Caryn A. Bills-Windt
Keith Ellis
Jacquelyn DeLaurentes
Peter Okema
Eric Stabb
Donald Kamm
Keana Mane Galloway

)	United States District Court
)	Northern District of Illinois
Plaintiff)	
)	
v.)	
)	
)	
Defendant)	

COMPLAINT

District Attorneys

District State Attorneys

State District Attorneys

Attorney Generals

Kwame Raol

State Attorney Generals

Kim Foxx

Attorney State Generals

Surgeon Generals

Inspector Generals

Department of Justice (DOJ)